REMARKS

Claims 1-19 had been in the application. Claims 1-12 having been withdrawn from consideration are canceled. Claims 13-14 and 17-18 are amended and claims 20 and 21 are added.

The specification has been amended as suggested by the Examiner to identify the patent number of the parent application.

Claims 13 and 17 have been amended to improve clarity. Specifically, wording is changed to clarify that the limitation concerning maximum interlayer peel strength of a coextrudate of the core layer and the adhesion resistant layer is for characterizing the composition of the core layer only. Basis for this amendment is found on page 21, lines 6-22.

Claims 13 and 17, have been amended to recite the broad wavelength range disclosed at various locations in the application such as page 23, line 31. Claims 14 and 18 are changed to eliminate the obvious redundancy with ranges of claims 13 and 17. New claims 20 and 21 define the invention according to the narrower range of UV radiation wavelengths of former claims 13 and 17. No new matter has been added by the amendments.

Claims 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. The Office Action asserts that that reference to a coextruded composite confuses the meaning of the steps of the method of making the multilayer article. The amendments obviate this rejection.

The amended claim recites that the core layer comprises a crosslinkable polymer. The composition of the crosslinkable polymer is further defined by poor natural adhesion to the first adhesion resistant layer. A crosslinkable polymer suitable for

the core layer is one which provides an interlayer peel strength between the core layer and the first adhesion resistant layer of less than 40 g/cm when these layers are merely coextruded. That is, the claim limitation recites an empirically determinable, objective criterion for selecting acceptable crosslinkable polymers. To identify whether a polymer has suitably insufficient adhesion, one can coextrude the adhesion resistant layer with a core layer comprising the polymer and measure the interlayer peel strength of the resulting composite.

The Examiner correctly construes that step (B) of making the article generically calls for placing the first adhesion resistant layer in contact with the core layer. Coextrusion is one of many ways of contacting the layers. It is not the only way. Step (B) carried out by coextrusion of the layers is thus a species of the claim which is generic as to the techniques for placing the layers in direct contact.

Claim 17 has been amended similarly to characterize the composition of the crosslinkable polymer of the core layer in relation to the second adhesion resistant layer. Because the claims are now clearly defined, Applicants request that the rejections be removed.

Claims 14 and 18 stand rejected on grounds that they impermissibly recite broader numerical ranges than claims from which they respectively depend. Amendments to the claims obviate these rejections. Additionally Applicants respectfully urge the Examiner to consider the disclosure of page 23, line 26 through page 25, line 10. There it is explained that intercrosslinking of the layers at their interfaces can be achieved by radiation in the range of about 170-400 nm. Radiation in this range can also penetrate deeply into the composite to cure the core layer polymer. New claims 20 and 21

are directed to embodiments in which narrower radiation ranges are effective to perform the intercrosslinking.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn at this time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 18, 2005
2205 Silverside Road
Wilmington DE 19810
Facsimile:(302) 475-7915

Jeffrey C. Lew
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 35,935
Telephone:(302) 475-7919